


REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner is requiring the election of a single disclosed species, in which each of  $R^1$ ,  $R^2$ , and  $R^3$ , and any additional variables for a particular species, must be defined in present claim 1.

Applicants have elected the species pertaining to compound F, as shown on page 8 of the present specification. Compound F is reproduced below for the Examiner's convenience.



Applicants traverse the election requirement on the following grounds.

Applicants make no statement regarding the patentable distinctness of the species, but note that for restriction to be proper there must be a patentable difference between the species, as claimed. M.P.E.P. § 808.01(a). The Examiner, however, merely makes the conclusory statement that no claims are generic to all figures. The Examiner has not discussed or submitted any reasoning or evidence whatsoever that addresses the patentable distinctness of any species in the claims.

Applicants further assert that the pending claims relate to a dermatologic preparation (claims 1-3), a humectant (claim 4), a skin barrier function reinforcing agent (claim 5), and a diamine derivative (claims 6-7) that all include a diamine derivative of formula I or II. Therefore, there would be no undue burden to search the non-elected species during a search of the claimed inventions having the elected species.

Application No. 10/731,249  
Reply to Office Action of May 1, 2006

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the election of species requirement is improper and that all species should be examined in the present application. Therefore, the withdrawal of the Election of Species requirement is respectfully requested.


Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
Norman F. Oblon

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

  
Richard L. Chinn, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 34,305

**Bryant Young**  
**Registration No. 49,073**